



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/214,251	03/10/1999	DAVID JOHN KING	CARP-0067	9023
34133	7590	06/12/2003		
COZEN O'CONNOR, P.C. 1900 MARKET STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-3508			EXAMINER HELMs, LARRY RONALD	
			ART UNIT 1642	PAPER NUMBER
			DATE MAILED: 06/12/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

23

<b>Advisory Action</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/214,251	KING ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Larry R. Helms	1642

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

THE REPLY FILED 06 May 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on 06 May 2003. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
  - (a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): See Continuation Sheet.
4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5.  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: none.

Claim(s) objected to: none.

Claim(s) rejected: 5,9-17 and 19.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8.  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.
9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) ( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 102(b), 103 with Zapata [a] and Zapata[b], 103 with Jacobs and Bodmer, 112 second, 112 first.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The rejection of claims 5, 9-17, 19 under 103 with Zapata [a] and Zapata [b] and Faanes is maintained. The response filed 5/6/03 states that Zapata [a] teach longer circulatory half life with loss of antigen binding and one would not have been motivated to add high molecular weight PEG. In response to this argument, Zapata [a] clearly teaches that modification with either size did not affect the ability of the molecule to bind antigen. The response then argues that Faanes does not teach modification by attaching to the hinge region. In response to this argument, it appears that the response argues the reference individually and this rejection is based on a combination of references. It would have been obvious to use the Fab' o Zapata and modify it with high molecular weight PEG as taught by Faanes because Zapata's Fab' is designed to be modified at one position and the molecule still retained antigen binding.